



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PREPOSITIONAL COMPOUNDS WITH THE DATIVE IN HIGH-SCHOOL LATIN AND THE FIRST YEAR IN COLLEGE

BY EMORY B. LEASE
The College of the City of New York

Should the rule for prepositional compounds with the dative be banished from the Latin grammar? If retained, should it be taught in the high school? What is the actual value of the rule? How often does it help? How often does it mislead? These questions we should like to submit to the readers of the *Classical Journal*.

This rule has recently been vigorously assailed and, we believe, justly so, by Professor Edwin W. Fay in the *Classical Quarterly*, V (July, 1911), 194: "The rule for the dative with compound verbs has long seemed to me a regular lazy-bed for grammarians; for pupils a very opiate and narcotic to reflection." Who was responsible for perpetrating this purely mechanical rule upon the pupil, we know not. But as early as 1878 Draeger in his epoch-making work practically said that there was only one trouble with the rule and that was that it wouldn't work (*Histor. Synt. d. lat. Spr.*, I, 377). Today the rule is to be found in some form or other in every Latin grammar, and in one widely known and widely used, these significant words are to be found as "the conclusion of the whole matter": "But the usage varies in different authors, in different words, and often in the same word and the same sense. The lexicon must be consulted for each word." "'Tis true, 'tis pity and pity 'tis 'tis true." Would that this "Note" had been given a position of greater conspicuousness and had been printed in larger type! I do not think there can be any doubt that the chief cause of the trouble has been that the pupil has entertained an exaggerated idea of the value and importance of this rule, with the result, frequent shipwreck. Possessed of remarkable mucilagi-

nous qualities it has stuck in the pupil's mind when other much more important rules have passed into his mind and out, without finding a secure resting-place. Accordingly in writing a prose composition exercise, he uses the dative simply because the verb happened to begin with one of those prepositions, or in accounting for a certain ambiguous case-form he at once jumps to the conclusion that the word is in the dative, simply because his eye has happened to light upon one of those compounds somewhere in the vicinity. Is not this a common experience, and is not the rule clearly "an opiate and narcotic to reflection"? To cite one example by way of illustration: Recently considerable merriment was caused in the class when the pupil with this sentence before him (Livy xxi. 32. 13): "*iis ipsis tumultis, quos hostes tenuerant, consedit*," without stopping to think, accounted for the case of *tumultis* by saying: "dative on account of a compound of *con*"! A little thought would have shown him that it was not a dative at all, but an ablative. It is better to have *thought* and lost than not to have thought at all! It is generally maintained that the study of Latin is an excellent training of the reasoning faculties. But this rule is an "opiate." The mere fact that the grammars feel the necessity of adding a note to this rule to the effect that, if the dative is used with any of these compound verbs, it is on account of the "acquired meaning," is on the face of it a confession of the weakness of the rule. Inasmuch as to convey meaning is the object of language, it is the *meaning* of the verb, whether compounded or not, that settles the particular case used. The logic of the situation, therefore, demands that, if the dative cannot be accounted for because the *meaning* of the compound verb does not come within the scope of any of the rules now given in the grammars, an addition should be made to the rules. On the other hand, if this mechanical rule were abolished, every dative would then furnish a good intellectual exercise in order to determine the particular variety used; in other words, the pupil would then be forced to *think*—"a consummation devoutly to be wish'd." *Sed haec hactenus.*

We now leave the general aspects of the case and turn to the question, What is the actual value of the rule in H. S. L. and the

first year in college?¹ Tersely put, the question is: How often does the rule work, how often does it not work? This latter phase of the question has not hitherto received the attention it deserves. To determine its value, therefore, it is necessary to take into consideration all of the compounds, and to note not only how often a dative is used, but also how often some other case is found; how often a preposition, and, inasmuch as verbs which are used in the passive take an accusative when used in the active, it follows that the number of times the passive is used absolutely should also be taken into consideration. However, not all compounds were taken into account. Verbs like *proficiscor*, *profugio*, *progredior*, etc., which never take a dative, as also those which take a clause as the object, were excluded. The results are here summarized:

I. CAESAR: dat. 51 times, acc. c. dat. 50, pass. c. dat. 8. Result: to use the vigorous Anglo-Saxon, in Caesar the rule works 109 times, but does not work 838 times. In Caesar the value of the rule is 11.4 per cent.

II. CICERO: dat. 45, acc. c. dat. 41, pass. c. dat. 35. Result: in Cicero the rule works 121 times, but does not work 641 times. In Cicero the value of the rule is 15.8 per cent. In H. S. L. prose the rule works 230 times, but does not work 1,479 times, and its value in H. S. L. prose is 13.4 per cent (an ominous number).

III. VERGIL: dat. 73, acc. c. dat. 93, pass. c. dat. 13. Result: in Vergil the rule works 179 times, but does not work 717 times.² In Vergil the value of the rule is 19.9 per cent.

IV. LIVY I, XXI AND XXII: dat. 87 acc. c. dat. 94 pass. c. dat. 56. Result: the rule works in Livy 237 times, but does not work 1317 times. In Livy the value of the rule is 15.3 per cent. Cic., *C. M.*, *Lael.*: the rule works 54 times, but does not work 358 times. In Cicero the value of the rule is 13.1 per cent.

SUMMARY

In H. S. L. the rule works 409 times, but does not work 2,196 times. Result: the utmost that the most ardent admirer of this rule can say is that in H. S. L. it is worth 15.7 per cent, and in the

¹ The writer has thought it sufficient to include in H. S. L. four books of Caesar's *Bell. Gall.*, six orations of Cicero (*Cat.*, *Arch.*, *Pomp.*), Verg., *Aen.* I-VI, and for the first year in college, Livy I, xxi and xxii, Cic., *Cato M.*, *Lael.* This investigation, therefore, covers a grand total of 18,893 lines (Caes. 2776, Cic. 2825, Verg. 4755, and Livy 6316 Cic. 2221), certainly more than "a straw which shows which way the wind blows."

² This total includes 33 occurrences where the compound "takes" the dative, but where classical prose requires a preposition.

first year in college¹ worth 14.8 per cent, in the two combined, worth 15.3 per cent.² (In college, works 291 times, does not work 1675 times).

CONCLUSION

The question, Should this rule be taught in the high school? is answered by the very simple fact, that a rule that works in only 15.7 per cent of the times used is no rule at all (*vide* Dictionaries s.v. "Rule").

If this conclusion should seem to anyone to be too revolutionary it is his bounden duty to warn the pupil before he goes to the labor of committing this rule to memory that it is worth only 15.7 per cent, and that in the case of *super* it is worth nothing at all in H. S. L.; in the case of *ante* its value in the first term in college is represented by 0. If this be done, the dire consequences of this rule will be greatly diminished.³ But this is not all. As a protective measure it is his duty to take one step further; he should call the student's attention not only to the times the rule works, but also, and especially, to the times it does not work, being careful in every instance to explain the reason for the particular case used.

We shall now consider the rule from another point of view, and ask, Is there any real necessity that will justify its existence? Is it not true that the rule has caused more trouble than it is worth?

¹ It is believed that the lists of occurrences given above are substantially accurate, as their accuracy has been constantly checked by the use of Lodge's *Vocabulary to High School Latin* and Steele's *Case Usage in Livy*, II. "The Dative," Leipzig, 1911.

² As Sallust and Nepos are sometimes read in the high school, it may be here noted that in Sallust (*Cat.*, *Jug.*) the value of the rule is 11.6 per cent, and in Nepos 15.2 per cent.

³ It may be noted here that in Caesar *ante* is worth 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent (acc. twice [antece]do], pass. c. dat. once [antepono]; in Cicero worth 100 per cent (dat. twice [antece]llo], acc. c. dat. once (antepono), pass. c. dat. once (antepono); in Vergil worth 100 per cent (dat. once [antefero]). The value of the remaining compounds in H. S. L. expressed in percentages is as follows: *ad* 16.1, *circum* 5. 4, *con* 4.9, *in* 26.3, *ob* 23, *prae* 39.8, *pro* 11.3 and *sub* 19.6. In Livy xxi and xxii, *ad* 10.2, *circum* 12.2, *con* 6.3, *in* 17.7, *inter* 26.3, *ob* 17.9, *prae* 26.7, *pro* 4, *sub* 17.5, and *super* 66.7 (found 6 times, 4 with dative, *supersum*, and 2 in pass. abs., *supericio*, *superpono*). In Livy 1 the value of *circum*, *pro* and *sub* is 0. In Cicero the value of *circum* and *super* is 0, but of *ante* 100 (*antepono*, acc. c. dat. 2, pass. c. dat. 2) of *prae* 47.1 (*-cipio* 1, *-dico* 1, *-fero* 1, *-scribo* 2, *-sum* 2, *-sto* 1), but without a dat. 9.

When grammars state, as they do, that, if a dative is used, it is due to the *meaning* of the compound, do they not practically admit that to some degree, at least, the rule is unnecessary? Most of them then cite such compounds as *consulo*, *confido*, to which we may add, *concedo*. With these, the particular case used depends upon the particular *meaning* of the compound. There is nothing new in this—*tonsoribus notum est*, but the fact is significant. What is true of these verbs is, we maintain, true of all. As the *meaning* of the compound is the all-important factor, not the two or three letters found at its beginning, it follows that if the meaning necessary to explain the dative is not found in the existing rules, their scope must be enlarged. To illustrate: as adjectives of “nearness” take the dative, why not a *verb*, also, that has a similar meaning?¹ If, for some reason, this is not possible in Latin, it is still possible to account for the dative with such verbs by saying that the action did not reach the object, only came up *to*, i.e., it is a dative of the indirect object. This would account for the dative with the class of verbs represented by *adpropinquo*, and that with the verb used for “meeting” a person, *occurro* (the accusative would be all right if the action was direct, i.e., knocked the man down), could be thus explained, or by calling it a “dative of disadvantage.”²

It is not the purpose of the writer to record every individual use of a dative with a prepositional compound, and show how it can be explained by other rules. Space would not permit, nor, if it did, would it be desirable. It is sufficient to say in a general way that every dative owes its existence to its two fundamental meanings, “*to*,” action not direct upon, and “*for*,” the dative of personal interest, advantage, or disadvantage. Hence any verb, no matter what its prefix, no matter what combination of letters are found at its beginning, takes the dative, if its meaning is “favor, help, trust,” etc., and “their opposites,” such as *impendeo*, *insidior*,

¹ I find I have been anticipated in this view by Zumpt, *Lat. Gr.*, ¶ 412.

² Professor Fay’s explanation of the dative with *adpropinquo* is, however, different (see *Classical Quarterly*, V, 194). Others too, may not agree with the writer’s explanations of the various datives used. All that we maintain at present is that the dative depends upon *some meaning* of the verb, and it is hoped that in time the right one will be discovered.

succurro, etc. So also, many verbs which have both accusative and a dative, take the dative of the indirect object, or of advantage or disadvantage. Under the latter head are to be explained, e.g., the common *bellum inferre* with a dative (Ca. 7, Ci. 2), and with other abstract nouns (Ca. 3, Ci. 1, V. 1; cf. *adferre* with abstracts, Ca. 1. 53. 6, Ci. 7, V. 2). The dat. of the concrete nouns, Ci. 3. 22, *templis ignis inferre*, is to be regarded as a dat. incom. or of indirect object (*inferre*=*addere*). Datives with such verbs as *praeficio* (Ca. 4, Ci. 1, V. 2) and *praepono* (Ca. 1. 54. 2, Ci. P. 63) are due to the meaning, "to put in *command* of." In poetry, as is well known, a dative is frequently employed with these compound verbs where in classical prose a preposition would be required. It is not at all improbable that the early vogue of the rule was largely due to the lack of making a sharp distinction between poetical and prose usage. Without going into further details, I should again like to refer the reader to Professor Fay's article in the *Classical Quarterly*.¹

As stated above, a dative is used with these compounds 409 times, but there is no dative 2,196 times. Space will not permit the citation of all occurrences in which dative is not used. In the following lists, therefore, verbs like *accedo*, which is used with a preposition 8 times, with an acc. 6 times (V.), and with a dat. once (Ca. 2. 7. 2) are excluded.

PREPOSITIONAL COMPOUNDS IN H. S. L.

I. ONLY WITH AN ACCUSATIVE: 661 times.

ad: cendo, cingo, cipio (51), cumulo, cuso, amo, hibeo, ipiscor, iuvo, ministro miror, moneo, oleo, orior, orno, oro, vello, ficio, flecto, for, gerare, gredior, grego, gnosco, loquor, pellare, peto, probo, cesso, ripio, spicio, sequor, servo, tendo, tingo, trecto (184).

ante: antecedo, Ca. 3.8. 1; 4.11. 2 (2).

circum: fero, flecto, scribo, spicio, sisto, sto, venio (14).

¹ One passage I have reserved for a special note: Caes. B. G. 2.27.3: *proximis iacentibus insisterent*. *Iacentibus* is called dative by Harpers' *Latin Dictionary* and the passage is generally explained: "They stepped upon those who had fallen." But, as the idea here is clearly local (cf. 4.33.3, *in iugo insistere*) *iacentibus* (*eis*) must be explained either as a dative depending upon *proximi* or as an abl. abs. (The accus. is used with *insisto* in Ca. 3.14.3 and V. 6. 563.)

- con*: erceo, gnosco, go, hibeo, hortor, ligere, lustro, buro, memoro, moveo, munio, pellare, perio, plector, pono, prehendo, primo, probó, cilio, cido, clamo, cupisco, demno, ficio, flo, formo, fundo, gemo, gero, scribo, sequor, scendo, sector, servo, solor, spicio, spicor, sumo, tamino, tego, temno, tineo, tundo, vecto, vello, voco, volvo, ripio, robo-ro (212).
- in*: gnoro, lustro, pedio, petro, ploro, precor, cendo, cido, colo, crepito, curvo, cuso, dignor, eo, findo, fitior, flecto, no, opinor, sequor, simulo, spicio, stigo, struo, texo, tueor, vado, venio, viso, vito, retio (87).
- inter*: cludo, ficio, cipio, imo, luo, mitto, pellare, rogo, scindo (19).
- ob*: duco, eo, lecto, ligo, loquor, ruo, scuro, sideo, stringo, struo, tineo, testor, trunco, cido, cludo, culo, culto, fendo, mitto, perior, peto, primo, pugno, stento (73).
- prae*: beo, cedo, metuo, mitto, nato, texo, verto, video (19).
- pro*: duco, emo, luo, moveo, mulgo, rumpo, sequor, tendo, traho, pello (19).
- sub*: igo, ministro, ruo, sequor, veho, pleo, rigo, sido, spicor, tineo, texo, traho vecto (29).
- super*: mineo, V. 2; impono, V. 1 (3).

II. PASSIVE ABSOLUTE: 664 times.

- ad*: cendo, cido, cingo, cipio, cuso, hibeo, iuvo, ministro, miror, olesco, operio, versor, ficio, figo, fingo, flecto, fligo, gerare, pellare, cesso, rigo, scribo, servo, specto, spergo, tennuo, tono (127).
- ante*: none.
- circum*: duco, eo, cludo, fundo, munio, scribo, sedeo, benio (19).
- con*: acervo, emo, erceo, gnosco, go, hortor, ligare, moveo, muto, mo, paro, perio, pono, prehendo, primo, probó, celebro, cludo, ficio, figo, flo, formo, fundo, gero, quiro, scribo, sector, servo, solor, spicio, stringo, sterno, sumo, temno, terreo, texo, tineo, vello, vinco, voco, ripio, robo-ro, rumpo (215).
- in*: lustro, mineo, pedio, pendo, petro, cendo, cido, colo, gnosco, eo, ficio, flecto, flo, fringo, sero, stituo, sterno, struo, texo, tueor, pugno, venio, vestigo, vito, rideo, rito (118).
- inter*: cipio, ficio, icio, fundo, mitto, pono, rumpo (54).
- ob*: duco, eo, ligo, lino, ruo, scuro, servo, signo, stringo, tego, tineo, torqueo, tundo, cido, cludo, culo, culto, cupo, fendo, mitto, primo, pugno, servo (66).
- prae*: duco, ficio, fligo, fundo, lato, pello, pulso, rumpo, ruo, sterno, tegno, veho, voco (22).
- pro*: duco (2), ficio (2), fligo (Ca. 1, Ci. 1), fundo (Ci. 1), lato, pello, pulso (Ca. 1, Ci. 1), rumpo (V. 1), ruo, sterno, (Ci. 2), tego (V. 1), veho (Ca. 1, V. 4), voco (Ci. 1) (22).
- sub*: cido, fodio, fundo, levo, ministro, moveo, porto, tendo, traho, veho (21).
- super*: none.

III. ONLY WITH PREPOSITIONS: 67 times.

- ad*: cubo *in* (Ci. 1); curro *ad* (Ca. 3); equito *ad* (Ca. 1); sum (Ci. *cum* 2, *in*, 1; *ad*, V. 2); vento *sub* (V. 1); voco *in* (V. 1); licio *ad* (Ci. 1) (13).
con: haereo *cum* (Ci. 1); loquor (Ca. *cum* 1, *inter* 1); meo (Ca. *ad*, Ci. *cum*); curso *circum* (Ci. 1); fligo (Ci. *cum* 2, *inter* 1; pass. Ca. *cum* 4); fugio *ad* (V. 1); grego, pass. *in* (Ci. 1); sentio (Ci. *ad* 2, *cum* 2); venio (Ci. *ad* 1, *in* 2); torqueo (V. *ad* 1, *in* 2); moror *apud* (Ci. 1); munico pass. with *cum* (Ca. 1); certo *cum* (V. 1); cido *in* (V. 1); iuro (Ca. *inter* 1, *contra* 2) (29).
in: cedo (V. *ad* 1, *per* 2); cido (*in*, Ca. 1, Ci. 1, V. 1, *super* V. 1); cludo, *in* (Ci. 3 pass.); fluo *in* (Ca. 5); formo *ad* (Ci. 1 pass.); mitto *in* (Ci. 1, pass.); silio *in* (Ca. 1); repo *in* (Ci. 1); rumpo *in* (Ca. 1); veterasco *ad* (Ci. 1); (sinuo, acc. and *inter* Ca. 1) (21).
pro: cumbo, with *ad* V. 2.426, with *secundum*, Ca. 4.17.4; *super* V. 6.504 (3).
sub: urgeo, with *ad*, V. 5.202 (1).

IV. WITH NEITHER ACCUSATIVE NOR DATIVE: 46 times.

- adsuefacio*, pass. with abl., Ca. 2, Ci. 1; *appetens*, gen., Ci. P. 7; *appareo*, abl., V. 1, with *in* V. 2; *comitor*, acc. V. 3, pass. Ci. 1 (24), with abl. V. 2 (1.312; 2.580); *commisceo*, pass. with abl. V. 4 (3.633; 4.120, 161; 6.762); *consisto*, abl., V. 4, with *in* Ca. 4; *constare*, abl., Ci. A.18; *infigo* abl., V. 1 (1.45), pass. with abl. V. 4.4; 5.504, with *sub* V. 4.689; *infrendo*, abl. V. 3.664; *innitor*, abl. Ca. 2.27.1; *invehor* abl. V. 5; *obstipesco*, abl., V. 2; *occido*, abl. V. 2.581; *occubo*, abl., V. 1.547; *praefigo*, pass. with abl. V. 5.557; *succingo* pass. with abl. V. 1.323; 6.555; and *supersedeo*, abl. Ca. 2.8.1.

V. WITH ONLY ACCUSATIVE AND A PREPOSITION (including Pass. Abs.) 384 times.

- ad*: adduco, prep., Ca. 7, Ci. 2, pass. abs. 16; *adeo*, acc. (4-2-8), *ad* Ca. 1, Ci. 1; *adaequo* acc. Ca. 2, Ci. 1, pass. abs. Ca. 1, with *cum* Ci. A. 29; *admitto*, with acc. and *in* Ca. 1, pass. Ca. 2, V. 1; *adquiro* acc. V. 1, *ad* Ci. 1, pass. abs. 1; *adigo* acc. Ca. 2, with *ad* Ca. 1, pass. Ca. 3; *adveho* with *ad*, V. 1, pass. V. 2; *ascendo* with *in* V. 1, acc. Ca. 2, V. 1; *ascisco* with *ad* Ci. 1, pass. 1; *attollo*, V. 18 (acc. 14, with *in* 1, *ab* 1, pass. 2).
con: *cogito* acc. Ci. 7, with *de* Ci. 5, pass. Ca. 2, Ci. 4; *conduco*, acc. Ca. 1, pass. Ca. 1, *in* Ca. 1; *confero*, acc. Ca. 4, V. 1, with *ad* Ci. 7, *in* Ca. 6, Ci. 5, *cum* Ci. 1 (2, 24); pass. abs. Ca. 4, Ci. 1, with *in* Ci. 1, *cum* Ci. 3.15; *conicio* acc. 6 (3-1-2), *in* Ca. 9, *inter* V. 1, pass. Ci. 1, V. 1, *in* Ca. 2; *comporto* pass. Ca. 1, *ad* 1; *coniungo*, acc. Ci. P. 26, V. 1.514; 5.712, with acc. and *cum* Ca. 1.37.4, 38.6; 2.3.4, 26.1; 4.16.2, Ci. 3.8; 4.15, pass. with *cum* Ca. 2.4.4; 3.11.3; Ci. 1.11, P. 19, and *inter* Ci. 1.33; *comparo*, acc. Ca. 4, Ci. 3 pass. Ca. 9, Ci. 5, with *cum* Ca. 1.31.11; *compleo* acc.

- Ca. 4, V. 1, with abl. V. 6, pass. Ca. 4, Ci. 1, with abl. V. 5. 46, *compellere* in Ci. 1, pass. V. 1; *consido sub*, Ca. 1; *in* Ca. 2, V. 3, *trans* Ca. 1, *contra* Ca. 1, abl. V. 9, loc. V. 1; *contendo ad* Ca. 12, V. 1, *cum* 6 (4-1-1), *contra* Ca. 1, V. 1, *in* Ca. 5, V. 1, abl. V. 2, pass. Ca. 2; *converto* acc., V. 1, *ad* Ci. 2, *in* Ci. 1, V. 1, pass. (6-8-4), *in* V. 1 (168).
- in*: *immergo inter* V. 1, abl. V. 1; *impello* acc. V. 6, *in* Ci. 1, V. 1, pass. Ca. 3; *importo* acc. Ca. 1, pass. with *ad* Ca. 2; *ingredior* acc. Ci. 1, *intra* Ci. 1, *in* Ci. 2, abl. V. 2; *inflammo* acc. C. abl. V. 1, *ad* Ci. 1, pass. 5, abl. V. 1; *inscribo in* Ci. 1, pass., *in* Ci. 1, abl. V. 1 (34).
- ob*: *obliquo in* V. 1; *obnitor* abl. V. 4. 406, *in* V. 5, 206; *obsideo* acc., Ca. 1, V., *cum* Ci. 1, abl. V. 3, pass. Ca. 1, Ci. 3, V. 2 (15).
- prae*: *praecipito in*, Ca. 1, acc. V. 2; *praesentio in* Ci. 1, acc. V. 1 (5).
- pro*: *procedo* acc. Ca. 1.38.1 (*vis*), *in* 1, *ab* 1; *proicio* acc. Ci. 1, V. 1, *ad* Ca. 5, *in* V. 4, *ante* V. 1, abl. V. 1, pass. V. 1; *profero* acc. V. 1, *in* Ci. 1, pass. Ci. 3; *prohibeo* 7 (41-42), abl. Ca. 3, Ci. 2, *ab* 4 (2-1-1), pass. with abl. 3 (1-1-1) (42).
- sub*: *suscito in* V. 1, acc. 2 (3).

VI. ONLY WITH THE DATIVE: 105 times.

Accido (11), accumbo, adversor, agglomeror, allabor (V. 3), anno (V. 3), appropinquo (6), assentio, asto (V. 1), antecello (Ci. 2), constat (3), contingit (3); ignosco (2), illabor (V.2) illudo (V.2), immineo (3), impendeo (5), incurro (V. 1), indulgeo (4), innato (V.2), insidior (4), insurgo (V. 3), insto (V. 2), in uro, pass. (Ci. 2); obluctor (V. 1), oboedio, obsecundo, obsisto (3), obsto (V. 3), obsum, obtempero (3), obvenio, occumbo (V. 1); praecurro (Ci. 4.19), praesido (4), praestat, praestolor, praesum (9); prosum (Ci. 3. 27); succumbo (V. 1), succurro (V. 3), surrideo (V. 1), suscenseo (Ci. 1).¹

VII. NOTEWORTHY COMPOUNDS.

Adfero, acc. c. dat. Ca. 1.53.6, Ci. 1.25: 2.4:17: P. 2, 33, 41, 64, V. 3. 310; 5. 201, but with *ad* Ca. 1.43.8, Ci. P. 25 and 45; pass. c. dat. Ci. P. 4 and 39; *adiungo*, acc. Ci. 4.10: A.15; acc. c. dat. Ca. 3.2.5, Ci. 3.12: 4.8: acc. c. *ad* Ci. P. 35, pass. c. dat. Ci. 3. 4. A. 22, c. *ad* P. 47; *antecedo*, acc. Ca. 3. 8. 1; 4. 11. 2, but *antecello*, dat. Ci. 4. 3, P. 14; *committo*, acc. (6-1-2), acc. c. dat. Ca. 1. 42. 5: 4. 21. 9, Ci. P. 31, acc. c. *cum* Ca. 1.15.2; *concurro*, *ad* Ca. 3.22. 4, *in* V. 2.315; dat. V. 1.493; *confido*, dat. Ca. 1.40.14; 42.5: 53. 2; 3. 25. 1, with abl. Ca. 3. 9. 3. natura, 27. 2 tempore; *congregior cum*, Ca. 1.40.7; 2.23.3, with dat. V. 1.475: 5, 809. *impono* acc. Ca. 2, V. 4; acc. c. dat. Ca. 1. 44. 2 (stipendium victis), V. 9 times (1.49 2.619; 4.418; 453; 639; 5.463; 6.246; 253; 774), pass. c. dat. V. 2.

¹The verbs in the above lists are used but once, unless otherwise specified. It may be added that of these 43 verbs, only nine (glomeror, sentio, tango, gnosco, ludo, uro, sisto, rideo, censeo) take the accusative in the simple verb.

707; 3.355; 6.308; *incumbo*, *ad* Ci. 4.4, P. 19, dat. V. 7 (cf. *incubare* c. dat. V. 1.89; 4.83; 6.610); *intersum*, *inter* Ca. 1. 15. 5; Ci. 1.10; 3.5; 4.9, gen. Ca. 2. 5. 2, dat. 4.16.2 proelio, abl. Ci. 4.9 mea; *obliviceor*, gen. Ca. 1.14.3; Ci. 1.7: 4.1; V. 7 times, acc. V. 2.148 amissos Graios; *occurro*, acc. V. 5.36, dat. Ca. 6 times, Ci. once (3.18), V. 3.82; 6.479, pass. c. dat. Ca. 1.33.4; *subeo*, acc. Ca. 2 (1.36.7; 2.27.1), Ci. 1 (2.15), V. 8 times, dat. V. 6 (3.292; 5.176; 203: 346; 6.222; 812), abl. 2.708; 4.599; *suspendo*, acc. c. dat. V. 6.858, acc. c. abl. V. 1. 318; acc. c. *ab*, V. 5.489, pass. abs. V. 7 times.

In closing, a bit of personal experience may not be amiss. The writer would assure the reader that he has practiced what he preached, and that for several years he has banished the rule from his classroom, and that in one respect, at least, he has been pleased with the result: the pupil has been forced to *stop and think*. Is not that worth while?